

Application/Control Number: 10/662,998
Art Unit: 2161

Page 10 of
12

REMARKS:

Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 112

The OA rejected claims 9 and 17 as being indefinite due to the claims' use of the word "substantially". This rejection is now moot as claims 9 and 17 have been deleted and none of the pending claims, i.e. newly added claims 25-63, use the word "substantially".

Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 103

The OA rejected claims 1-24 as being obvious over Dooley (US Patent Application No. 20020035611) in view of Feeley (US Patent Application No. 20040068460). This rejection, as it relates specifically to claims 1-24, is now moot since claims 1-24 have been deleted in this Amendment. However, in order to particularly point out what is patentable with newly added claims 25-63 and to anticipate likely rejections from the examiner based on past Office Actions, please consider the following remarks.

The OA at footnote #4 on page 4 states:

Figs.3&4 show an example of a web site with 'bid rankings' which are similar to those used by the search engine. As seen by Fig.3, the steps of listing the 'current bid', 'current position', 'network high bid', and 'new bid' is consideration of detail for the ranking, which correspond to the act of analyzing the web site. (emphasis added)

All pending independent claims, i.e. 25, 36, 46, 55, and 56, include a limitation of ("analyzing the Web site code" or "analyzing the code") and a limitation of ("a Web site comprises the Web site code", "a Web site code defines how a plurality of Web pages for the Web site will be displayed by a browser", "the Web site comprises a Web site code", or "the code comprises a means for defining how a web page for a Web site is to be displayed by a browser").

Assuming Figs. 3 & 4 show elements "which correspond to the act of analyzing the web site" as stated in the OA, Figs. 3 & 4 do not correspond to the claim limitations for the newly

Application/Control Number: 10/662,998
Art Unit: 2161

Page 11 of
12

added claims of “analyzing the Web site code” or “analyzing the code”. (emphasis added)
Specifically, analyzing Figs. 3 & 4 of Feeley, while showing “bid rankings” for a Web site, are silent as to any analysis regarding the “code” of the Web site. This can be shown by the fact that the “code” of a Web site could be edited or modified extensively without changing the “bid rankings” in Figs. 3 & 4 because the “bid rankings” in Feeley appear to be based solely on a bid amount and are therefore independent of the “code” of the Web site. Thus, Figs. 3 & 4 do not teach analyzing the Web site “code” or analyzing the “code”.

In addition, the OA at footnote #5 on page 4 states:

‘Adjusting bid amounts’ correspond to the editing of the web site and because of the adjusting of the bids, the ultimate goal is to maintain the position at the top of the search results, which would increase the expected flow of traffic.

All pending independent claims, i.e. 25, 36, 46, 55, and 56, include a limitation of causing or facilitating a modification or edit of a Web site “code” or “code” based on the analysis of the Web site code or code.

Assuming “‘adjusting bid amounts’ correspond to the editing of the web site” as stated in the OA, the ‘adjusting bid amounts’ does not correspond to the claim limitations of modifying or editing Web site “code” or “code”. This can be shown by the fact that ‘adjusting bid amounts’, as taught by Feeley, is accomplished without modifying or editing the “code” of a Web site. Thus, ‘adjusting bid amounts’ as taught by Feeley does not correspond to editing the Web site “code” or “code”.

Application/Control Number: 10/662,998
Art Unit: 2161

Page 12 of
12

Conclusion

All claims currently present in this application are believed allowable over all of the art of record and prompt further examination of the application and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Any questions or suggestions regarding the application or the added claims submitted herewith should be directed to the undersigned attorneys for applicant at the telephone number listed below or by email to the email address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

The Go Daddy Group, Inc.

Date: 9/14/2006

/Stewart J. Womack/ Reg.# 45,230

Stewart J. Womack
Attorney for Applicant

The Go Daddy Group, Inc.
14455 N. Hayden Road, Suite 219
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
480.505.8832